



Pantomime Riots

Author(s): W. J. Slater

Source: *Classical Antiquity*, Apr., 1994, Vol. 13, No. 1 (Apr., 1994), pp. 120-144

Published by: University of California Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25011007>

REFERENCES

Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:

https://www.jstor.org/stable/25011007?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



University of California Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Classical Antiquity*

JSTOR



Pantomime Riots

IN WHAT FOLLOWS I discuss the circumstances under which pantomimes caused theater riots, and in particular the first great riots of 14 and 15 A.D. in Rome; no pantomime troubles are recorded in the second century after Trajan, and those thereafter are connected largely with the circus and the circus factions. We have many examples of modern theater riots, where a simple cause was alleged, but that have turned out to be the result of more serious underlying tensions. The Roman historians also tend to tell us about the spark, not the less easily quantifiable kindling.¹ It is not at all self-evident that the ballet dancing of Greek tragic themes should have caused the Romans to indulge in rioting so frequently. In fact, it is so incomprehensible that one is surprised that only one attempt at explanation has ever been given for these earlier events. Perhaps there can be strictly speaking no comprehensive explanation for a riot, for many

In this article, "Leppin" refers to H. Leppin, *Histrionen: Untersuchungen zur sozialen Stellung von Bühnenkünstlern im Westen des römischen Reiches zur Zeit der Republik und des Principats*, Antiquitas, Reihe 1, Abhandlungen zur alten Geschichte 41 (Bonn, 1992). "Roueché" refers to C. Roueché, *Performers and Partisans at Aphrodisias in the Roman and Late Roman Periods*, JRS Monograph 6 (London, 1993).

1. The metaphor comes from Philo's comment on the Egyptians' readiness to riot: *Flacc.* 17. On Roman theater rioting the best work is still H. Bollinger, "Theatralis Licentia" (diss. Basel: Winterthur, 1969). Marc Baer, *Theatre and Disorder in Georgian London* (Oxford, 1992), demonstrates that the simple explanation offered at the time and later for the Covent Garden Riots—viz., higher theater prices—is completely inadequate; he shows that a number of general social issues were in play, and also that the demonstrations were highly organized. But he also concludes that we shall never know the exact interplay of all these factors. This is exactly my own view of the ancient riots.

long-standing personal motives as well as group pressures can be triggered by the sudden catalyst of mass emotion. But time and place are important, and some of the group pressures can be isolated or postulated, even when the nexus between them will always resist scrutiny.

PANTOMIMES

Pantomimes were like ballet dancers who performed as soloists largely tragic myths, wearing different masks for different characters. They did not normally²—for it is difficult to generalize about such a complex phenomenon—speak or sing, but only danced, sometimes, at least, in a highly erotic fashion.³ The names for these performers tell us something about how their art was viewed. The most common terms for them are the imprecise *orchēstēs* in Greek, and *pantomimus* or *histrion* in Latin. But it is important that a Greek pantomime of imperial times called himself formally in Greek an “actor of tragic rhythmic movement” rather than by the rare Greek term παντόμιμος; “all-mime” had, evidently, overtones of the genre mime, regarded by the Greek dramatic profession as an inferior genre, while “rhythmic movement” suggested the noble calling of the *palaistritēs*, and “tragic” suggested the dignity of Greek tragic themes. On the other hand, the general Latin term *histrion* can include both pantomimes and mimes.⁴ Doubtless there was for the Latin spectator some overlap: one cannot in practice always distinguish a Latin dancing mime from a pantomime in imperial times.⁵ Again, we know, for example from Horace *Sat.* 1.5, that Sarmentus, perhaps a dwarf jester, is a *scurra*—that is, a mime—but also dances the Cyclops dance, which would need a mask.⁶ Despite this imprecision in our sources, it is generally agreed that the public pantomime of the dominant Pyladic variety was what we should rather call a spectacle,⁷ in

2. The usual generalization must be qualified: e.g., G. Manganaro, “Pankarpeia di epigrafia latina,” *SicGymn* 23 (1970) 77–79, treats a Roman epitaph (*Epigraphica* 29 [1967/68] 94–97) of the third century A.D. that describes a lady of allegedly blameless repute; she both sang and danced various tragic roles (“Ae]cidas saltavi, carmen amavi”) apparently not too seriously (“lascivo lusu”)—somewhat surprisingly, since she specialized in stepmothers like Phaedra (“ob nover]cales vultus fui cognita digne”), if Manganaro’s supplement is right. We would therefore have here an anomalous female (panto)mime who both sings and dances tragic roles, but surely not at the same time.

3. Juv. 6.62ff.; “im höchsten Grade schlüpfriß,” says Friedländer *ad loc.*, with further references.

4. Leppin 6–18 and 125, and below, n. 80, for the Greek terms. Comedy, tragedy, mime, Atellan, and dancing are all covered by the word *histrion*.

5. For example, on *ILS* 5201 = *CE* 411 Bücheler, from Rome, “Parasitus Apollinis, idem / [quar]tarum in mimis saltantibus utilis actor,” Dessau notes, “intellege fabulas salticas,” which implies pantomime; but “of the fourth parts” refers to mime.

6. Wüst, *RE* s.v. “Pantomimus” (1949) 845. Courtney, on Juv. 6, Oxford fr. 27, should not say that mimes do not wear masks: better on the passage is J. Colin, “Juvénal, les baladins et les rétiaires,” *AAT* 87 (1952–53) 315–85, esp. 333.

7. Plut. *QC* 7.8.3, 711E: “As for dances I should disqualify [sc. from private parties] the Pyladic, as pretentious and emotional and requiring a large cast; but . . . I will accept the Bathyllic. It is a straightforward unaccompanied dance, verging on the *kordax*, and presents a danced interpretation of Echo or some Pan or Satyr reveling with Eros.”

that the solo dancer could be combined with large and multicolored casts and sets as well as a chorus.

It comes as a surprise that historians of ancient Rome accused pantomimes of being responsible, ever since Augustus and Maecenas first publicly sponsored them in 22 B.C.,⁸ for the decay of public morals.⁹ We do not now believe the stories that pantomime was simply a Roman invention of 22 B.C.,¹⁰ for there is good evidence that Greek tragic pantomime had existed elsewhere for some centuries before.¹¹ More significantly, though the subject is still obscure, some kinds of pantomimic dancing were Etruscan and then native Roman,¹² and had been especially common in religious ritual.¹³ But whatever its origins, there is no doubting the instant success of Augustan pantomime, which led to the belief that it was an import in his reign, and that the freedmen of Maecenas and Augustus, Bathyllus and Pylades, were the originators of the Roman genre. The pantomime may well have contributed to a popular demand for theater, for by 11 B.C. at the latest, two more permanent theaters had joined the Theater of Pompey in Rome, providing a seating capacity unparalleled in the ancient world.¹⁴

THE EVENTS OF 14/15 A.D.

If one is to understand the underlying reasons for the riots, a review of the theatrical events of these years is unavoidable. On August 19th, 14 A.D., Augustus died after ruling for forty-four years. He had enjoyed the theater and the

8. Jer. *Chron.* 2.143 Sch., Athen. 1.20d, Tac. *Ann.* 1.54. The difficulties in interpreting this tradition are discussed by E. J. Jory, "The Literary Evidence for the Beginnings of Imperial Pantomime," *BICS* 28 (1981) 147–61.

9. Zos. 1.6.1, Tac. *Dial.* 29.4 with Gudeman *ad loc.*, Livy 7.2.

10. M. Adele Cavallaro, *Spese e spettacoli*, Antiquitas, Reihe 1, Bd. 34 (Bonn, 1984) 184 n. 98; Wüst (above, n. 6) 834; the most influential article was by L. Robert, *Hermes* 65 (1930) 106–22 = *Opera Minora Selecta* 1.654ff.

11. O. Weinreich, *Epigrammstudien* 1, *Epigramm und Pantomimus*, SHAW 1940, 1.1 (Heidelberg, 1941), collected the evidence.

12. Wüst (above, n. 6) 844. A great deal has been written about the Etruscan *pyrrichē* recently; cf. W. Slater, "Three Questions," *Phoenix* 47 (1993), with further literature. There is a valuable summary of the discussion on "ballets étrusques" by the greatest authority, J. P. Thuillier, "Sur les origines étrusques du théâtre romain," in C. Landes, ed., *Le théâtre antique et ses spectacles* (Lattes, 1992) 201–8. The Etruscan *ludiones* at Livy 7.2.4 specifically do not in their *haud indecoros motus* imitate any song by their dancing to the pipes.

13. Varro *ap. Serv. ad Verg. Georg.* 5.73; but pantomime is normally to be sharply distinguished from dancers who also sing, as the Arval brethren did.

14. It is mistaken to repeat that pantomime needed a "Kennerschaft . . . die man recht eigentlich auch nur als gebildetes Mitglied der Oberschicht erwerben konnte": so R. Meinel, *Das Odeion* (Frankfurt, 1980) 366. Cf. Leppin 151, criticizing Friedländer and others. It was not an upper-class fashion. Libanius, *Pro Saltatoribus*, 64.112F: "Some god, taking pity on the illiteracy of ordinary people, brought on dancing as a substitute kind of instruction for the masses about deeds of old; and now the goldsmith will keep up a decent conversation with the product of the schools about the House of Priam or Laius."

amphitheater, and had made a point of pleasing the people by his presence.¹⁵ Tiberius by 14 A.D. did not.¹⁶ In fact he so disliked the whole idea of pleasing the people by large expenditures on games and gladiators, and what had become in Livy's words (7.2) the *vix tolerabilis insania* of the theater, that Suetonius affirms:¹⁷ "He gave no spectacle at all; and he very rarely attended those that were given by anyone else, in case anything was demanded of him." His withdrawal from public appearances, alleges Suetonius, was provoked by anger that he was required by tradition to give freedom to the pantomime Actius in response to the demands of the mob.¹⁸ He spent little on public buildings, and, though he undertook some work on the Theater of Pompey, probably because of a fire in the theater in 21 A.D., yet he did not finish even that.¹⁹ The gladiator Triumphus could recall in the reign of Tiberius the good old days of *munera* that were gone,²⁰ doubtless filled with nostalgia for the liberality of Augustus's years. It would seem a fair conclusion, even when we discount anti-Tiberian tradition, that Tiberius's policy was less generous toward public entertainment than that of his predecessor or his successor Caligula, for it was ironic that the pantomimes are reported to have been the first to profit from the legacy of good finances that Tiberius left behind on his death.²¹ At any rate he is not recorded to have had pantomimes or actors as companions, despite the fact that Mnester and perhaps Actius had been his freedmen, but rather he sought the company of astrologers and grammarians.

There was a pantomime riot at the *Augustales ludi* in the year 14,²² that is, at

15. Suet. *Aug.* 45.2. I have found useful for general background R. F. Newbold, "Social Tension at Rome in the Early Years of Tiberius' Reign," *Athenaeum*, n.s., 52 (1974) 110–43.

16. Jory (above, n. 8) 152 and "The Early Pantomime Riots," in *Maistor: Classical Byzantine and Renaissance Studies for Robert Browning* (Canberra, 1984) 62. B. Levick, *Tiberius the Politician* (London, 1976) 122, writes: "Gladiatorial and theatrical performances and the circus he hated, and attended them only for a short time"; but Levick adds "nor had Tiberius ventured to make the transition to austerity too sudden" (sc. in 14), presumably on the basis of Dio 57.11, who records only that he showed false enthusiasm for the regular games; compatible is Tac. *Ann.* 1.54.4. But the new austerity was immediately visible, to judge from our evidence; cf. Cavallaro (above, n. 10) 16 n. 31, citing E. Tengstrom, *Erano* 75 (1977) 43ff., esp. by contrast with the earlier times painted by Suet. *Aug.* 45.2, Tac. *Ann.* 1.54.3.

17. *Tib.* 47.1; Cavallaro (above, n. 10) 16.

18. Leppin s.v. "Actius," who argues that he is a comedian, but other Actii are pantomimes; Suet. *Tib.* 47. Dio 57.11.6 gives a different version of Tiberius's reasons. For the legal problem, cf. *Dig.* 7.11.3 (Alexander to Justina): "Divo Marco auctore amplissimus ordo censuit, ne quis spectaculo, quod edatur, actorem suum alienumve servum manumitteret et, si factum esset, pro infecto haberetur."

19. Tac. *Ann.* 3.72 says the theater burned and Tiberius promised to restore it; Suet. *Tib.* 47 says that he did not finish restoring the theater. C. Courtois, *Le bâtiment de scène des théâtres d'Italie et de Sicile* (Louvain-la-neuve, 1989) 211, argues, like Furneaux *ad loc.*, that only the *scaena* can be meant. Apparently, the main theater of Rome was notably incomplete and neglected during the last fifteen years of Tiberius's reign.

20. Sen. *Prov.* 4.4; Levick (above, n. 16) 123 n. 25.

21. Dio 59.2.5.

22. On their date at the beginning of October and the circumstances, see W. D. Lebek, *ZPE* 75 (1988) 59–71; Cavallaro (above, n. 10) 121ff., 251ff.; Jory, "Riots" (above, n. 16), whose version of

the first games honoring Augustus, which were held only a month after his death. We do not know if Tiberius was there, though he was a member of the newly constituted *Sodales Augustales*. Both Tacitus and Dio mention these riots.²³ Tacitus says:²⁴ “The annual games established in honor of Augustus were also begun. But their inauguration was troubled by disorders *ex certamine histrionum*,²⁵ that is, because of a competition of pantomimes.²⁶ Augustus had tolerated such performances out of indulgence to Maecenas.” Tacitus finishes ominously “*alia Tiberio morum via*.” Dio adds that the riot was set off by a pantomime’s refusal to appear for the pay offered.²⁷ The tribunes, to whom unusually the games were entrusted, and who had previously asked, but not been allowed, to use their own money, were forced to convene the senate that same day in desperation and ask it for more than the appointed money.²⁸ It looks as if they had been aware in advance that the *certa pecunia* allocated by the state would not be enough, and had anticipated trouble by asking to add their own funds to it.²⁹ We unfortunately do not know if they got the money they wanted,³⁰ but the nonappearance of a star certainly disrupts a *certamen*; and it is worth visualizing the realities of a riot, in which an audience of up to twenty-five thousand keep up their shouts, as the senators scurry out of the orchestra to hold an impromptu session, before returning to renewed rowdiness. The power of the crowd and their organizers is evident. This in fact would be the only example of a blackmailing strike known on the ancient stage; and one can reasonably suppose that Roman professional dancers, with few and surprising exceptions slaves and freedmen, and officially subject to legal ignominy, could surely not have dared

events differs a little from mine. R. Saller *per epist.* complains that the games would be a sign of imperial generosity, not the contrary; but funeral games would be a ritual necessity, and the populace and their organizers obviously thought they were inadequate. Jory *loc. cit.* points out that the amount recorded in the later *Fasti* is “miserly.”

23. Vell. Pat. 2.126.2 only summarizes: *compressa theatralis seditio*.

24. *Ann.* 1.54.2.

25. This passage is regularly mistranslated, e.g., “da rivalità fra gli histriones,” Cavallaro (above, n. 10) 127. That pantomime competitions took place in earlier imperial Rome is certain from *ILS* 5197; cf. Leppin 217–18; Jory, “Riots” (above, n. 16) 65. On pp. 60 and 61 n. 18 Jory understands “contests” here but thinks that Tacitus may not have got it right.

26. See Wüst (above, n. 6) 858–59; Jory, “Riots” (above, n. 16) 57–66, esp. 60–61; Leppin 174ff.; cf. G. Wissowa, *Römische Religionsgeschichte* (Munich, 1912) 454 n. 3: “*certamina sacra* in Ulpian are the Greek *hieroi agōnes*”; cf. *ILS* 5177, 5178, where the Capitolia are called a *certamen*. In Tac. *Ann.* 14.21 the pantomimes are banned from the sacred contests of the Greek games of Nero to prevent partisan rioting; but they were allowed on stage, i.e., not in a competitive context. Here we have the real reason why they were not admitted to Greek sacred contests until the second century—not because they or their performances were inferior, but because their competitions were known to be dangerous to social order.

27. Dio 56.47.2.

28. Jory, “Riots” (above, n. 16) 60 n. 16. There is a parallel with 22 B.C. (Dio 54.2.3), when the praetors took over the organization of games from the aediles; then too the praetors were restricted in the amount they could spend from their own funds.

29. Cavallaro (above, n. 10) 36, 128.

30. Leppin 62 is overconfident to say that the pantomime “setzte eine Erhöhung seiner Gage durch.” Likewise Jory, “Riots” (above, n. 16) 60.

openly to subvert imperially sponsored festivities and bring pressure on the senate unless they were confident in advance of political support at a high level. The failure to fund such important games adequately is remarkable, and it is difficult not to see that this, in the light of the tribunes' behavior and the reaction of the crowd, is a result of a new and expected fiscal stringency in theatrical matters.

In the following year, 15 A.D., the riots started again.³¹ The events were memorable enough to be mentioned by six different historians.³² This time the pantomimes caused a series of riots, and were responsible for insults to the magistrates. Tacitus is most specific. The senate was summoned, and moved to flog the pantomimes; but this was vetoed by a tribune—doubtless aware of his colleagues' past and potential problems with the *ludi Augustales*—on the interesting but not necessarily truthful grounds that Augustus, the admirer of the artists, would not have approved of this allegedly novel attitude. The senate then came to these revealing decisions, grouped as financial and social regulations. There were first resolutions *de modo lucaris*—about the means of supplying public financing for games; according to Suetonius's account,³³ this money was reduced. The reason given for the riot of the preceding year, namely, insufficient public funding, thus seems indirectly corroborated. The senate now did the opposite of what was wanted by the rioters; this would appear to echo the wishes of Tiberius.

Tacitus then selects the *maxime insignia* from the other resolutions: senators were forbidden to go to the houses of the pantomimes, and knights were forbidden to join their processions; the pantomimes were also forbidden to appear³⁴ except in public, that is, not in private homes; and the praetors were to have the power to punish offending spectators with exile. We learn therefore that senators had been going to the houses of the pantomimes, and that knights had joined in the public entourage of the pantomimes, the demonstration to the public of influence, patronage, and power. It would also seem that private performances were given to elite audiences by the pantomimes, either in their own homes, which suggests considerable means, or in the houses of their aristocratic fans. Finally, greater control had to be exerted over the spectators.

In regard to the same crisis, Dio,³⁵ who had commented earlier on the violent and cruel behavior of Drusus, which led Tiberius often to rebuke him publicly, refers to his drunkenness and adds: "He was so friendly with the pantomimes that they rioted and did not come to order even under the laws that

31. Cavallaro (above, n. 10) 36.

32. Tac. *Ann.* 1.77, Dio 57.14.10, Vell. Pat. 2.126.2, Suet. *Tib.* 34.1, Zos. 1.6.1; and I accept Jory's contention that Valerius Maximus's reference (2.4.1) to the theaters as urban military camps is a politically correct allusion to the events of 14 and 15: Jory (above, n. 8) 152.

33. Suet. *Tib.* 34.

34. *spectarentur* mss.: *sectarentur* was conjectured by Wölfflin.

35. Dio 57.13.1, 14.10.

Tiberius brought in to control them.” This adds two facts to the context. It was the notoriously dissolute Drusus who was partly responsible for the problems;³⁶ and one may reasonably conjecture that it must have been his backing that enabled the unnamed pantomime of the previous year to carry out his blackmail, and embarrass the tribunes. In that case he would be supporting the pantomimes, at variance with the expressed policies of the senate and his father; but in the year 15 he was also consul and only about thirty years old. What were “the laws that Tiberius had brought in to control the pantomimes”? One assumes that these are the same as the senate resolutions of 15 mentioned by Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.77, quoted above) and amplified by Suetonius,³⁷ who notoriously fails to date things, but does report that Tiberius reduced the cost of the games and shows by cutting down the pay of the pantomimes and limiting the pairs of gladiators to a fixed number. If this represents the legislation of 15 A.D., we gain the information that by 15 at the latest the excessive costs of the gladiators as well as pantomimes were reduced by legislation.

We can therefore fit another piece of information about gladiators into place for the year 15. This comes from Dio confirmed by Tacitus,³⁸ and leads in a new direction. In unnamed games given by Drusus, son of Tiberius, in his own name and that of Germanicus, two knights fight, and one is killed. The survivor is forbidden to fight again by Tiberius, who did not attend. This is clearly not a financial measure, but a social one. Tiberius and the senate disapproved under certain circumstances both of knights fighting as gladiators, and of their appearing on stage. These offenses must be treated together, for the history and the wording of legislation against such appearances, as we shall see below, show that they represented the same generic offense by the same people and deserved the same penalty.³⁹ Once again Drusus is found sponsoring games offensive to his father and the senate.

To summarize: Tiberius and the senate try to control the power, and the costs, of the pantomimes. They are opposed by popular sentiment. In two instances Drusus, whose relations with his father are alleged to be degenerating, is found to be supporting performances condemned by Tiberius, though there is, of

36. Jory, “Riots” (above, n. 16) 52: “The pantomimes had an influential friend at court”; he suggests that Drusus prevented the antipantomime measures from being effective. Leppin 140: Drusus followed “Darbietungen mit übermässiger Leidenschaft.” For Drusus’s drunkenness and Tiberius’s alleged dislike of him, see also Suet. *Tib.* 52.

37. Suet. *Tib.* 34.1.

38. Dio 57.14.3; cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.76.5, who remarks that there were various reasons given why Tiberius stayed away: Tiberius’s dislike of crowds, his gloomy character, his fear of being compared negatively with the affable Augustus; but Tacitus rejects the view that Tiberius wanted to show Drusus’s brutality. I am indebted to the valuable articles of W. D. Lebek, “Standeswürde und Berufsverbot unter Tiberius: Das SC der Tabula Larinas,” *ZPE* 81 (1990) 37–58; and “Das SC der Tabula Larinas: Rittermusterung und andere Probleme,” *ZPE* 85 (1991) 41–70, where the problems of the definition of the knights and the *transvectio* are discussed; it is clear that this subject is murkier than many have assumed, but it is not directly relevant to this paper.

39. See below on the Tabula Larinas.

course, no evidence whether he actively supported the disruptive activities of the spectators. Since the attraction of the pantomimes was such that even senators and knights kept company with them, clearly there were some in both orders who supported them as did Drusus.

The legal measures of 15 A.D. against them were in any case ineffectual, and later events also help to explain the riots of 14 and 15 A.D. Tacitus says of the year 23:⁴⁰

Tiberius at last brought up the question of the effrontery of the *histriones*, [saying] that they were frequently the fomenters of sedition against the state and of debauchery in private houses; the old Oscan farce, a most trivial pleasure with the crowd, had come to such a level of indecency and influence that it needed the authority of the senate [i.e., not just praetors] to restrain it. The *histriones* were then banished from Italy.

Suetonius (*Tib.* 37.2) adds that he also banished the “heads of the factions,” the first mention of a factor omitted in the previous riots, unless they are meant by the “spectators” whom the senate had decreed could be exiled. It cannot be doubted that *histriones* are or consist largely of pantomimes, who had gone too far for the old emperor, but there is no agreement among scholars as to how the “old Oscan farce” is to be connected with them, though clarity here would have been most valuable to us.⁴¹ It is worth adding to the solutions offered that the old and popular Roman *ludus talarius*, which was likewise morally offensive,⁴² was also quasi-pantomimic, as is clear from the behavior of Caligula, the first emperor to perform as gladiator, charioteer, and dancer.⁴³ He terrified senators by dancing before them to the accompaniment of flutes and *scabella* in a *palla* and a *tunica talaris* with a *canticum* as libretto. Whatever the exact genre of their offensive public performance, the pantomimes had also continued to take their erotic dancing into the private houses of the aristocrats. Though we cannot know what attempts were

40. Tac. *Ann.* 4.14.4, Vell. Pat. 2.126.2.

41. Dio 57.21.3 calls the offenders *orchēstai*. For the Oscan farce here, cf. Cavallaro (above, n. 10) 41 n. 26. Leppin 66 n. 29 thinks of *exodia*, as does Furneaux on Tac. *Ann.* *ad loc.*, p. 508. Jory, “Riots” (above, n. 16) 62 n. 32, understands pantomimes to be meant but does not say how he takes them to be connected with the *oscum ludibrium*. The Atellan farce, if that is what is meant, was certainly spoken drama. If Tacitus is referring to only one type of performance, the danced performance was erotic and satiric with political overtones. If on the other hand Tiberius criticized both pantomimes and also the old Oscan farce as an integral part of pantomime competition—performed perhaps in the intervals, or as an *exodium*—then the Atellan of the *iuvenes* (cf. n. 75, below) had acquired a new and potent form. We would have in any case an important indication that pantomime competition in a wider sense could be used for political ends, as Pliny the Younger says (*Paneg.* 54.1).

42. Fronto, *On Speeches* 10; Leppin 186–88, with literature. My own view is that the censors must have banished the *ludus talarius* in 115 B.C. as well as 169 A.D. E. J. Jory, *BICS Suppl.* 51 (London, 1988) 79, promises to show that the *ludus talarius* played a part in the development of pantomime; I should agree.

43. Suet. *Gaius* 54.

made to control the theaters in the years after 14,⁴⁴ surely it is no coincidence that in the year 23 Drusus died, and, after many ineffectual complaints from the praetors,⁴⁵ in that same year the pantomimes and their faction leaders were finally banished, presumably after nine years of unrecorded troublemaking. The pantomimes had apparently lost their political protection, and they remained exiled for the next fourteen years, until Caligula brought them back.

REASONS FOR RIOTING

Jory is the only scholar to have asked the question: "What was it about the pantomime performances which produced such violent reactions and partisanship among the spectators?"⁴⁶ He has argued convincingly for an understanding of the riots in terms of the "passions aroused among the spectators by the nature of the performances." Further, the excellent point is made that pantomime created a massive audience for a star. The star mentality of course existed for mimes and dancers, for gladiators, and even tragedians;⁴⁷ but perhaps none were soloists in the same sense that pantomimes were. Pantomimes were indeed the great stars of antiquity, and their rewards, financial and social, were accordingly extraordinary.⁴⁸ Moreover, Jory rightly emphasizes the competitive nature of the pantomime performance. We can add that pantomimes were not till very late allowed into the Greek festival competitions of the Greek or Roman world, though the Greek festivals of Campania may have started the fashion around 100 A.D.⁴⁹ But this would be of little consequence, since they had much earlier their own separate competitions in Rome,⁵⁰ and that probably implies that a day-long program of competitions with suitable *entr'actes* had been developed by the time of Augustus. No doubt, then, the pantomimes could focus attention on themselves as solo performers in competition.

Jory's reasons seem to me to be both valid and important, but by themselves inadequate to explain the phenomenon. Dancing, even erotic dancing, may cause excitement, but not fatalities, and in what follows I attempt to suggest a

44. Cf. Jory (above, n. 8) 152.

45. "saepius inritis praetorum questibus," according to Tac. *Ann.* 4.14.3.

46. Jory, in "Riots" (above, n. 16), and to a lesser extent in "Evidence" (above, n. 8) 147ff. In BICS Suppl. 51 (London, 1988) 73ff. he discusses the evidence for theatrical competitions. M. Wistrand, *Entertainment and Violence in Ancient Rome* (Göteborg, 1992) does not mention pantomime.

47. Leppin 149 cites the example of the once-great actor Aesopus being hauled out of retirement to make a disastrous comeback at Pompey's great games.

48. Lebek, *ZPE* 81 (1990) 47–48. The social honors for Roman pantomimes are summarized by Leppin 101–7. Greek pantomimes were at this time free, and their honors, at least in terms of statues, citizenship, and magistracies, even greater.

49. Leppin 174, citing *SEG* 33.770.

50. See above, nn. 25, 26. Leppin seems to me to confuse the issue by treating only Greek-type competitions as *certamina*.

wider context, which may lack clarity, as these things are bound to do, but which tries to bridge this gap between theatrical passion and rioting.

Perhaps the timing of the pantomime riots is the easiest aspect to explain. The senate was concerned with the public processions of the pantomimes, and, later, Pliny could speak of the processions that accompanied these performers as they went through the streets, exceeding in size sometimes even those of the members of the aristocracy.⁵¹ We hear of no such public following for other dramatic performers. When Tiberius and the senate cut costs beyond the level the pantomimes were prepared to tolerate—and this too only one month after the death of Augustus, who had after all been responsible for the rise of the pantomimes—he misjudged their popular appeal. The remarkably swift response was the first of a series of increasingly violent theater riots to put pressure on the senate, and these were ended only by the removal of the troublemakers. But it would be naive, in view of what we know of such riots, to believe that this reaction and the determination with which it was pursued were completely spontaneous,⁵² and we can move on to an examination of the place where the riots occurred.

THE KNIGHTS IN THE THEATER

We must contemplate the unique physical arrangement of the theater if we are to envisage how a theater riot could arise; for riots are not recorded from the circus or amphitheater or forum or other areas for *munera* performance in Rome until later. The spatial relationships of the theater apparently fostered tension more than other venues in the first century; and this by itself may be a reason why pantomimes, rather than gladiators, caused trouble. The senate had awarded itself front seats in the orchestra long before the first permanent theater was built. Much later, in 67 B.C., the Roscian law was passed, which officially awarded the first fourteen rows to the knights.⁵³ It would seem that these arrangements were

51. Pliny, *NH* 29.9, refers to a modish doctor from Tralles in the time of Nero. His name is that of a great actor, and his title is one taken from the festivals: “[The doctor Thessalos] inscribed his own gravestone on the Via Appia with the title *hieronikēs doctor*. None of the pantomime artists [*histriones*] or charioteers appeared in public with a greater retinue”: Leppin 102. One should, however, note that there were public competitions in solving medical questions: *Inscriptionen von Ephesos* 1161–62, doubtless for *iatrosophistai*, and very close to Thessalus’s birthplace.

52. The main evidence for theatrical manipulation is now collected by Roueché, *Performers*, and *JRS* 74 (1984) 184–99. More detail could be added from Hellenistic times, but it would not alter the truth of her central thesis.

53. The details are easily found in the articles of Elizabeth Rawson, “Theatrical Life in Republican Rome and Italy,” *PBSR* 53 (1985) 97–113; and “Discrimina Ordinum: The Lex Iulia Theatralis,” *PBSR* 55 (1987) 83–114. I do not repeat the material of these fundamental studies. C. Schnurr, “The Lex Iulia Theatralis of Augustus,” *LCM* 17 (1992) 147–60, is a brief survey, which omits modern work of importance. The Roscian Law of course said much more, because we know that there were places reserved for knights who were military tribunes and knights who were bankrupt. Ségolène Demougin, *L’ordre équestre sous les julio-claudiens*, CEFR 108 (Paris, 1988) 799, is sure that the Lex Roscia banished the bankrupt from the XIV; certainly the Lex Iulia did, as Suet. *Aug.* 40.2 requires. But there was, after all, seating within the XIV for special groups; cf., e.g., Porp. *ad Hor. Epod.* 4.15.

made even more precise by a law called the *Lex Iulia Theatralis*, which cannot be dated, but may be best situated after 20 B.C.⁵⁴ But by then the great Theater of Pompey had been built, in 53 B.C., enshrining the knights' places in its architecture.⁵⁵ Now the entire citizenry of Rome could be organized by rank, seating, and dress. The theater was the geometrical symbol of order, and Augustus took great trouble to organize the seats and places according to the divisions he created.⁵⁶ The knights could possibly—though the figure is most uncertain—have had in Pompey's theater about two thousand places,⁵⁷ but they and their seats were far more prominent there than in (e.g.) the circus. An actor in imperial Rome had the emperor and the senate immediately before and below him, beyond that the fourteen rows of knights, and then the colleges of priests, the *decuriae* of the civil servants, and such like. Only then did one come to the people, who would be lucky to be within fifty meters of their favorite pantomime.

The knights were therefore numerous, highly visible, and presumably noisy in the theater, so that we should dearly like to know how their subgroups were distributed within the fourteen rows. When Germanicus died, the equestrian *ordo* moved to call one of the *cunei* of the theater by the name Germanicus,⁵⁸ who had been *princeps iuventutis*. Though a passage in Martial has been used as evidence that Gaius and Lucius were also names,⁵⁹ this particular *cuneus* was previously named for the *iuniores* of the equestrians.⁶⁰ Yet that is of little help, for since *iuniores* were under thirty-five, and *seniores* presumably over that,⁶¹ it is not clear how or why the *iuniores* could be accommodated in only one *cuneus*, especially the lowest fourteen rows of it. We can assume at least from this honor that the knights wished, perhaps on the basis of past usage, to associate Germanicus with the seating of their younger members. Much of the noise would come from those fourteen rows, and the organized clagues among the knights

54. Demougin (above, n. 53) 802; Lebek, *ZPE* 85 (1991) 43 n. 6, improving on Rawson, *PBSR* 55 (1987) 86.

55. T. P. Wiseman, "The Definition of *Eques Romanus*," *Historia* 19 (1970) 72.

56. Suet. *Aug.* 44.1. That Pythagorean-Platonic speculations—"iucunda magis quam necessaria subtilitate," according to Pliny—can underlie theater construction should not be doubted after L. Käppel's study of Epidauros in *JDAI* 104 (1989) 83–106; cf. the speculative remarks of P. Gros, "La fonction symbolique des édifices théâtraux," in *L'urbs*, CEFR 98 (Paris, 1987) 319–43, with further literature. This alone, I suspect, explains Vitruvius's extraordinarily long and puzzling digression about Aristoxenic harmonic systems in his treatment of the theater.

57. Demougin (above, n. 53) 812; but Rawson, who speculates on the size of senatorial posteriors, is far more cautious: *PBSR* 55 (1987) 105ff.

58. Tac. *Ann.* 2.83.5. The *cuneus iuniorum* became the *cuneus Germanici* on his death. Demougin (above, n. 53) 808 says there were six *cunei* in the Theater of Pompey on the basis of Vitruvius 5.6.2, 5.7.2, which are not probative; the Severan marble plan (E. Rodríguez Almeida, *Forma urbis: Aggornamento generale* 1980 [Rome, 1981] XXXII) does not show the *cunei*, and the figure six looks like a deduction from the Theater of Marcellus [ibid. XXIII]. Nothing remained in modern times.

59. Martial 5.14.1, Demougin (above, n. 53) 809. Both Gaius and Lucius had been made *princeps iuventutis* by the knights (*Res Gestae* 14).

60. Tac. *Ann.* 2.83.5, Demougin (above, n. 53) 808.

61. Demougin (above, n. 53) 214ff. discusses this problem.

and in the rows behind;⁶² this was after all their sole political forum, and they, or their subgroups, had long been able to organize their feelings there.⁶³ The compact position of any formal group of knights gave them high visibility and a leading role for the audiences of up to twenty thousand in the theaters of Pompey or Marcellus.

KNIGHTS AND PANTOMIMES

The knights were, as we have seen, friends with the pantomimes. Indeed, Seneca can say of young aristocrats, “ostendam nobilissimos iuvenes mancipia pantomimorum”; and members of both orders had been fraternizing with them in their houses. The noise of pantomime activity on the private stage, forty years later, could be said to fill the whole city.⁶⁴ But why were some of the knights and pantomimes so close? A need for professional private entertainment is not enough. A more intriguing reason is that some knights, at least, were themselves pantomimes.

The lacunose history of direct and voluntary involvement by the two orders in games requires that we treat pantomime and gladiatorial activity together, as we shall see was done by the laws of the time; compulsion by emperors is a separate issue and of no concern to us here. The first knight we know as a gladiator appeared in a festival given by Julius Caesar in 46 B.C.⁶⁵ In 29 B.C. a senator fights in public at the dedication of a temple, after this had been forbidden in previous years.⁶⁶ Tacitus could claim rhetorically that no member of the senatorial order had demeaned himself by professional acting until the time of Nero;⁶⁷ but in 23 B.C. a knight had appeared as a pantomime dancer with the approval of Augustus.⁶⁸ In 22 B.C.—the year when the control of games passed

62. The inscription recording the places for the Arvals in the Flavian amphitheater (*ILS* 5049) shows that they were entitled to places in the *cuneus* in different *maeniana*, presumably for their retainers and family. The Greek *cunei* often are allocated by tribe. There was therefore both a vertical and a horizontal organization.

63. Demougin (above, n. 53) 801; Lebek, *ZPE* 85 (1991) 42 n. 3; Suet. *Aug.* 34.2 refers to the violent opposition of the knights—or a group of them—against the *lex de maritandis ordinibus*. The *equester ordo* were the first to indulge in catcalls, when Princesps, the pantomime accompanist of Bathyllus, made a fool of himself in the theater, according to Phaedrus 5.7.30 and 33.

64. Sen. *Ep.* 47.17; cf. Pliny, *NH* 7.184: “[in venere obiere] duo equestris ordinis in eodem pantomimo Mystico, tum forma praecellente.” For what went on on the private stage, Sen. *QN* 7.32.3 is revealing, where for *det latus* cf. Juv. 6, Oxford fr. 19 *vibrare latus* and 3 *tremula manu*. Tacitus’s *foeda per domos* were serious enough that the Julian law on adultery allowed a husband the right to kill his wife’s adulterer “deprehensum domi suae [Macer in *Dig.* 48.5.25(24)] quive artem ludicram ante fecerit in(ve?) scaenam saltandi cantandive causa prodierit.” The law [*Dig.* 23.2.43ff. *ad fin.*] stating that a woman taking up acting after the marriage should be divorced looks like a reflex of the same problem. For *matronae*, see below n. 120.

65. Suet. *Div. Iul.* 39, Dio 43.23.5.

66. Dio 51.22.4.

67. Tac. *Ann.* 14.21.

68. Dio 53.31.3.

from aediles to praetors—we get a flurry of legislation, in which senators are forbidden to go on the stage.⁶⁹ About this time, Suetonius says, the senate forbade knights to go on the stage or act as gladiators. After that Augustus stopped encouraging this. But soon afterwards a dwarf senator appears as a *paegniarius*, and around 2 A.D. Augustus did not interfere when knights and women of good family appeared on the stage.⁷⁰ And they appeared again. In fact, in 11 A.D. equestrian gladiators were so popular that Augustus and the senate had to allow them to fight to the death, because they paid no attention to the penalties inflicted by law.⁷¹

This apparently chaotic development will only become comprehensible when we look at the complexity of the legal problems that resulted from the conflict between the senate and equally determined younger members of the orders.⁷² While the knights were even prepared to ignore penalties in order to fight to the death, the same determination can be seen in their resolve to appear on the stage. Originally Augustus had encouraged the aristocratic youth to engage in fighting and equestrian antics such as the antique Troy game in order that they might display their mettle, an important point to which we shall return in another context. This was perhaps in order,⁷³ but as the more skilled of the youth started accepting favors for these performances—that is, performing *quaestus causa* rather than *virtutis causa*—it ceased to be clear where the borderline between public display and actual artistic performance was to be set. Once started, however, the movement was not to be stopped, as young people wanted to demonstrate their skills in public, and impoverished, desperate, or infatuated members primarily of equestrian rank sought to get rich and famous.⁷⁴

GYMNASTIC TRAINING IN ROME

But there are two problems about this, which have not been directly addressed, so far as I am aware. Whereas it might be comprehensible that a young

69. Dio 54.2.5; not necessarily to be connected with Suet. *Aug.* 43.3.

70. Suet. *Aug.* 43.3, *Nero* 4; Dio 55.10.11.

71. Dio 56.25.7. I leave aside here the situation where a free person could apparently offer as a vow to fight as a gladiator, e.g., for the health of the emperor, as at Suet. *Gaius* 27.3–4. I know of nothing similar for dancing, though it should not be considered impossible.

72. See below and esp. Lebek, *ZPE* 81 (1990) 47ff.; Leppin (76; cf. 142ff.) remarks in the course of summarizing the issue; “Es ist ausserordentlich schwierig, die konkreten Auswirkungen der rechtlichen Bestimmungen auf die Histrionen zu beurteilen.” We can perhaps just follow the outlines of a complex legal wrangle.

73. But probably there was opposition even here. Asinius Pollio (Suet. *Aug.* 43.2) objected angrily to the Troy game, on the basis that his grandson had got a broken leg; but he probably objected as a conservative that equestrian training should not be public performance.

74. Sen. *Ep.* 99.13 (young men of good family driven into the arena by their spendthrift ways); and Tac. *Hist.* 2.62.2 on the *corruptissimum quemque adolescentium* even in the towns. But his formulation “*principes pecunia et saepius vi perpulerant*” is followed by the more accurate “*coloniae aemulabantur . . . pretio illicere*.” Compulsion there could be, but money was the chief attraction.

man of the upper orders could develop military and so fighting skills, how could he have acquired the professional skills necessary to appear as a pantomime, especially in 23 B.C., one year before the supposed introduction of pantomime officially to Rome? Roueché in her excellent study writes even of Greek youth: "All the skills and arts that were presented in contests and spectacles, with the possible exception of mime and acrobatics, were ones which young men of these associations could aspire to."⁷⁵ The traditional Roman aristocratic paramilitary training was "armorum et equorum campestris exercitationes,"⁷⁶ so that it was easy enough to become proficient with weapons and discover latent fighting skills. Pantomime, on the other hand, required acrobatic dance skills; it necessitated a notoriously difficult calisthenic training.⁷⁷ Though dancing was not officially part of Roman military training, it was and had always been an important part of the gymnasium exercise of the Greeks. There it was called *cheironomia*⁷⁸ and *skiamachia*;⁷⁹ it was a form of calisthenics designed to create graceful and

75. *Performers* 136. But she herself on the same page gives evidence for mimes in the Alexandrian gymnasium. The Beroian gymnasium law of the early second century B.C. (*SEG* 27.261, 67) specifically forbids any *akroama* to be introduced at the drinking in the Hermaia festival. In Rome the relation of Atellan farce to the free *iuvenes* at Rome is attested by Livy 7.2, for which see the commentary by P. Lebrecht Schmidt, "Postquam ludus in artem paulatim verterat: Varro und die Frühgeschichte des römischen Theaters," in *Studien zur vorliterarischen Periode im frühen Rom*, Scripta oralia 12 (Tübingen, 1989) 77–134, esp. 93; J. P. Morel, "La iuventus romaine et les origines du théâtre romain," *REL* 47 (1969) 208–52; J. P. Neraudau, *La jeunesse dans la littérature et les institutions de la Rome républicaine* (Paris, 1979) esp. 239.

76. Jean Louis Ferrary, *Philhellenisme et impérialisme*, BEFAR 271 (Paris, 1988) 511–26. The exercises of the *iuvenes* were "exercitationes campestris equorum et armorum" (Suet. *Aug.* 83.1; Plut. *Cato Mai.* 26; *Marcell.* 34.5), while Maecenas is alleged by Dio (52.26.1) to have urged getting teachers of arms and horsemanship for the *iuvenes*. The *iuvenalia* will follow this model (G. Ville, *Gladiateurs* 216ff., 267ff.). Polybius, *ap. Cic. Resp.* 4.3.3, had accused the Romans of neglecting the cultural side of boys' education. On *iuvenes* at Rome the article of H. Galsterer, *Athenaeum* 59 (1981) 410ff. remains valuable, despite the plethora of recent books: he argues persuasively that the Roman *iuvenes* were organized by *vici*, which would enable us to glimpse the grass-roots organization of the pantomime factions there; the same conclusion had been reached by S. Panciera, "Tra epigrafia e topografia," *ArchClass* 22 (1970) esp. 151–63; cf. below, n. 105.

77. The classic passage is Cyprian, *Epist.* 2. It conceals the difficulty to say (Lebek, *ZPE* 81 [1990] 47), "Tanzen Singen oder Fechten hatten viele von Ihnen [the equestrian youth] gelernt."

78. E. Mähl, *Gymnastik und Athletik im Denken der Römer* (Amsterdam, 1974) 21ff., collects the most important passages. For chironomy in the palaestra, add to the passages collected in Slater, "Three Questions" (above, n. 12): esp. Plato, *Leg.* 814–15; Plut. *Mor.* 747A; Dio Prus. 32.20; Galen, *De Sanit. Tuend.* 6.325.1, χειρονομίαι καὶ ἀπροχειρισμοί . . . κατὰ παλαίστραν; Diod. Sic. 1.16.1, παλαίστρας . . . καὶ τῆς εὐρυθμίας; Athen. 14.629b–c, who specifies that the movements come from choral dancing; Polyb. 9.20.6 on the connection between dance and palaestra; Synes. *De Insomniis* 20, τις ἐν παλαίστρᾳ χειρονομήσας. The εὐρυθμοὶ σοφισταὶ of Plut. *Mor.* 790F are chironomy instructors, not rhetoricians. The Odeum at Aphrodisias is called a palaestra: C. Roueché, *Aphrodisias in Late Antiquity* (London, 1989) 43.

79. M. Kleijwegt, *Ancient Youth* (Amsterdam, 1991) 109, does not mention dancing, but misunderstands what shadow fighting entails: "They [i.e., *iuvenalia*] comprised demonstration-fights with blunted weapons (*skiamachiai*), fights with wild animals (*venationes*) and horse riding." Certainly shadow fighting could take place in armor and with weapons (Posid. *ap. Athen.* 4.154a, referring to the outlandish Celts; Dio Cass. 66.15, of Titus as a *iuvenis*), but it normally denotes gymnasium shadow-boxing or -wrestling: Joh. Chrys. 49.51, σκιμαχῶμεν πυκτεύοντες; Philo, *De Cher.* 81, *Quod Det.* 41

rhythmic movement, especially in the mass dance called the *pyrrichē*.⁸⁰ These movements are, however, the same as those for which the pantomimes were famous or notorious. In fact the word *cheironomia*, like *pyrrichē*, is used for a type of pantomime. Again, we find a kind of pantomime called *orchestopala*, dancing-wrestling.⁸¹ The links between the training of pantomimes and the gymnasium exercises of the Greeks are therefore direct: the same language is used, the same movements.

Second, even if this is accepted, can we show that Greek dance exercises are proper for the aristocracy of the late Republic? This does not at first seem to be a likely proposition. Even much later Plutarch—tongue in cheek?—conveys the Roman prejudice:⁸²

The Romans were very suspicious of the use of oil, save in bathing, and hold that nothing has contributed so much to the enslavement and enfeeblement of the Greeks as their gymnasia and wrestling schools, which have bred much listless idleness in their cities, wasted time, encouraged unnatural vice, and ruined the bodies of young men with sleep and walks and rhythmical movements [cf. “actor of tragic rhythmic movement”] and elaborate diet, which, without their noticing it, have disarmed them and got them the name of neat gymnasts and clever wrestlers instead of sturdy horsemen and footmen.

We can of course find ferocious denunciations of Greek gymnastic nakedness by Cato and Cicero, the stupid exercises that encourage homosexuality and effeminate wiggings.⁸³ “*Iuventutis vero exercitatio quam absurda in gymnasiis*,” and so on, was the official Roman line,⁸⁴ not only in the Republic; dancing was an un-

(*skiamachia* equated with chironomy as in Plato, *Leg.* 830C); the best example is Paus. 6.10.3, describing a statue of the great boxer Glaukos of Karystos, portrayed *skiamachōn*, because he was the finest of his time at chironomy. Greek, therefore, like Dio on Titus above, has to add “with arms” to make the meaning clear, when pseudo-gladiatorial activity with *arma lusoria* is meant.

80. L. Robert, “Amulettes grecques,” *JS*, 1981, 3–44, esp. 38ff. = *Opera Minora Selecta* 7.465–506, esp. 500ff., with reference to his earlier work, and drawing attention to the importance of words like *kinēsis*, *charis*, *morphē* (Lat. *nitor*, *venustas*); Slater, “Three Questions” (above, n. 12) esp. n. 94, with reference to a forthcoming article of M. W. Dickie, “Palaestrites.”

81. W. Slater, “Orchestopala,” *ZPE* 84 (1990) 219ff.; there is much to be added, esp. W. J. Raschke, “Aulos and Athlete,” *Arete: The Journal of Sport Literature* 2 (1985) 177–200, on dance-boxing on a black-figure vase in New York; this should be called *anapalē*, the later *gymnopaideikē*; cf. the description in Athen. 14.631b.

82. Plut. *QR* 40, trans. H. J. Rose, who comments that the attack on athletics is as old as Euripides and Plato.

83. The essential affirmation of the difference between Roman public and private attitudes to dancing was made by G. Wille, *Musica Romana* (Amsterdam 1967). Most of the important passages of condemnation are assembled by Mähl (above, n. 78), including the often-overlooked passage in Vitruv. 9, *praef.* 1ff. A Jewish denunciation is to be found in 2 Maccabees 4.14: τῆς ἐν παλαιστοῖς παρανόμου χορηγίας. Plato, *Leg.* 636, already suggests that gymnasium exercises lead to homosexual encounters.

84. The quotation is from Cic. *Resp.* 4.4.4. The relevant passages are often cited, e.g., Sherwin-White on Pliny, *Ep.* 4.22.7 (Hor. *Od.* 3.24.51, *Sat.* 2.2.10; Tac. *Ann.* 14.14–15, 20–21; Pliny, *NH* 15.19, 29.26; Pliny, *Paneg.* 13.6; Mart. 7.32; Luc. 7.270; Suet. *Dom.* 4) since Friedländer.

Roman activity, just as it is a normal insult of the law court to call the accused a *saltator*. Though the priests of Mars and the Arval brethren might perform their dances, Seneca will not allow gymnastics into the *artes liberales*.⁸⁵ Such remarks were and are still cited as if this were an accurate description of the Roman picture.

Cicero, when he is talking off the public record in his letters or rhetorical works, sounds a different note. He tells us twice how useful it is for an orator to practice the same exercises of movement as a dancer.⁸⁶ He explains revealingly that when one watches young men playing ball, one can tell which ones have been trained in the palaestra; he says this with every sign of approval. He knew what Greek grace was, even if he and many later were happy to describe it as effeminate wiggling when it suited them. Later Quintilian too makes a fine distinction between the athletic “jocks” and those who practice chironomy;⁸⁷ of the latter he approves as did Cicero. But Tacitus, more hostile than any other ancient author, continues to thunder against the degenerate youth—“gymnasia et otia et turpes amores exercendo”⁸⁸—doubtless with the approval of the senate.

Romans, as Ferrary has pointed out, are registered in the gymnasium lists of Delos and Athens from the second century B.C.⁸⁹ Distinguished Romans abroad in Greek lands went cheerfully to the gymnasium. Then there are revealing

*Sittengeschichte*¹¹ 2.154ff. (cf. 4.281ff.) but usually without warning that the denunciation was not without a certain hypocrisy. Sometimes a false distinction is made between Republican rejection and acceptance in imperial times, e.g., by B. Appel, “Das Bildungs- und Erziehungsideal Quintilians” (diss. München: Donauwörth, 1914) 88 n. 59. The Romans themselves made fine distinctions between acceptable calisthenic exercises of various sorts and more violent sports such as wrestling.

85. *Ep.* 88.18.

86. Literature on early Roman and Etruscan dancing in Slater (above, n. 12). For gymnastics for the orator, see Mähl (above, n. 78) 21; Cic. *De Orat.* 3.83 (“De histrione dicendum. Negarem enim posse eum satis facere in gestu, nisi palaestram nisi saltare didicisset”), 1.73 (ballplayers show palaestra training; cf. Dio Chrysostom 31.162), 3.200 (“palaestra . . . ut cum venustate moveatur”), 3.220, 3.228; *Orator* 14, and the *apalaistrous motus* of *Orator* 228; Quint. 1.11.15, 5.10.121. *Palaestra* is used metaphorically of the polished elegance that comes from training (Cic. *Leg.* 1.6, *De Orat.* 1.81, *Orator* 186; cf. *Opt. gen. or.* 8) but also in Greek for a school of female mimes: Plut. *Anton.* 9.4, Procop. *Anecd.* 9.23. Most wealthy Romans had a palaestra or its equivalent, not, surely, just for putting up Greek statues, taking walks, or writing letters; they or their children could play ball there as well as in the *sphairstērion*; cf. R.Försch, *Archäologischer Kommentar zu den Villenbriefen des jüngeren Plinius* (Mainz, 1993) 69ff. The private *sphaeromachia* and *palaris lusio* (Statius, *Silv.* 4, proem 25), to which spectators were admitted, would be held there. These are not so much mock gladiatorial events as pantomimic calisthenics, *pace* Coleman *ad loc.*

87. Quint. 1.11.15. One must of course be aware of the great overlap that has always existed between rhetoric and pantomimic acting; cf. J. Bulwer, *Chirologia* (London, 1644); or G. Austin, *Chironomia: A Treatise on Rhetorical Delivery* (London, 1806). The dominance of rhetorical education will encourage even the physically inert to take up such exercises.

88. *Ann.* 14.20.

89. Ferrary (above, n. 76) 511–26 documents the reception of Greek culture by the Romans from the second century B.C. onwards. On p. 517 he quotes most aptly from L. Robert, *Noms indigènes* (Paris, 1963) 490ff: “Pour vivre à la grecque, il faut être élevé à la grecque, aller à l’école, se réunir au gymnase pour les exercices physiques et la culture intellectuelle.” Scipio already caused a scandal by reading and doing palaestra exercises in the gymnasium at Syracuse in 204 B.C., according to Livy 29.19.11.

examples. Velleius Paterculus⁹⁰ describes how one of the most distinguished men of Caesarean Rome, L. Munatius Plancus, "colored blue and naked, with his head covered with reeds and wearing a tail, on his knees, danced [the sea god] Glaucus at a dinner party." That is, he acted as a pantomime a Greek mythological theme at a private occasion. If Plancus could do that, or even be considered credibly to have done that, how many more were there who were less distinguished and military? And there are even earlier instances of similar invective: the *staticuli*, which Cato accused a tribune of practicing, are comic dance poses, as is clear from the use of the word in Plautus's *Persae*.⁹¹ It is therefore not to be doubted that the upper-class youth of the late Republic and afterwards could be skilled in the techniques of Greek chironomy.

GYMNASIA AND BATHS

One piece of evidence for this seems to me to deserve far more emphasis than hitherto. When Strabo came to Rome and lived through most of the reign of Augustus, he took the trouble to express his admiration for the new buildings that had gone up in the Campus Martius,⁹² the traditional playing fields of the Romans.⁹³ There he saw them exercising "at ball, hoop, and *palaestra*"; there too they raced their chariots. There were the three theaters, the Circus Flaminius, and the stone-and-wood amphitheater of Taurus. Beyond that were the open fields of the Campus, beside the Tiber, where the Romans traditionally swam. Augustus, whose legislation about sport and the exercises of the *iuvenes* is only partly understood, had built here a wooden stadium.⁹⁴ There he could hold a *gymnikos agôn*, in Greek style, doubtless for the athletes and boxers of which he was so fond, but perhaps not only for them.⁹⁵ Strabo, however, calls attention, as a Greek would, to the wonderful hydraulic facilities built by Agrippa.⁹⁶ Greek

90. Vell. Pat. 2.83.2 is a hostile witness, accusing Plancus of "doing anything for money." If the story is anything more than an extreme instance of the *saltator* invective, Plancus would have been at least forty years old, and in Egypt with Antony.

91. Cato, *ORF* fr.114–15, with the excellent commentary of Schmidt (above, n. 75) 93–94.

92. Strabo 5.3.8, duly noted by Nisbet and Hubbard at Hor. *Od.* 1.8.4; their commentary on the whole poem is significant. The passage is missing in Mähl (above, n. 78), and J. Delorme, *Gymnasion* (Paris, 1960), whose thesis is that Greek institutions did not affect the Romans.

93. T. P. Wiseman, "Strabo on the Campus Martius," *LCM* 4 (1979) 129–34.

94. Dio 53.1.5. For Augustus's policy on encouraging sporting activity, see H. Langenfeld, "Die Politik des Augustus und die griechische Agonistik," in *Monumentum Chiloniense: Studien . . . für E. Burck zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. E. Lefèvre (Amsterdam, 1975), 228–59; W. W. Briggs, "Augustan Politics and the Games of Aeneid V," *Stadion* 1 (1975) 267ff., with further literature. Much of the writing about Augustus's reforms of the *iuvenes* organizations is highly speculative; what can be deemed to be certain is of no value for the theme of this paper.

95. Mähl (above, n. 78) 34, citing Suet. *Aug.* 44.3; but boxing to music was as old as the Etruscans, and Augustus was merely following Sulla, Scaurus, and Caesar.

96. A survey of literature on Agrippa is in Cavallaro (above, n. 10) 30 n. 71; J. R. Patterson, *JRS* 82 (1992) 197–98; Inge Nielsen, *Thermae et Balnea* (Aarhus, 1990) 1.43–45, gives a survey of the Baths of Agrippa. These were really a mixture of Hellenistic gymnasium and baths, with at least one

writers call the Baths of Agrippa a gymnasium and not a *balaneion*, and revealingly it is said by our best source that Agrippa built a steam bath (*Laconicum*) because he admired the Spartans.⁹⁷ Dio tells us: "Next he constructed the Laconian sudatorium: he gave the name 'Laconian' to the gymnasium because the Laconians had a greater reputation at that time than anyone else for stripping and exercising after anointing themselves with oil."⁹⁸ Plutarch had singled out the Romans' aversion to athletic oil, whose provision was so central to the Greek gymnasium; Nero was soon able to donate oil to the senators and knights⁹⁹ for their exercises when he constructed the first certain Roman gymnasium in 60.¹⁰⁰

Agrippa deliberately built his hot bath and other facilities next to the Theater of Pompey, since that was presumably where the young men would appreciate these after their palaestra activities, even if it meant running the aqueduct across the Via Flaminia. In Alexandria too a main palaestra, which generated riots, had been next to the Theater of Dionysus.¹⁰¹ When he brought the waters of the Aqua Virgo to Rome's playing fields in 19 B.C., Agrippa was building what had long been missing from the Roman scene, an essentially Greek institution. The Roman authorities had resisted to the last having a permanent theater; that would be Greek and become a center of popular agitation.

palaestra; cf. B. Tamm, *Neros Gymnasium in Rom* (Stockholm, 1970). The oft-repeated statement (lastly R. König, *Plinius Naturkunde XXXVI* [Darmstadt, 1992] commenting on Pliny, *NH* 36.121) that Agrippa had already constructed 170 free baths is false. Pliny's *gratuita balinea* are free bathing days; cf. B. Laum, *Stiftungen* (Leipzig, 1914) 1.114, for these *gratuitae lavationes*.

97. It is a cliché that Laconia is connected with palaestra. Propertius 3.14 picks Sparta as the place for palaestra and its ballgames and hoop exercises; but one suspects he was more interested in the rumors of scantily clad girls there; cf. Cic. *Tusc.* 2.36. Agrippa probably got his ideas from Campania; cf. n. 98, below.

98. Dio 53.27; a *laconicum* is also mentioned together with a palaestra in the reconstruction of the Stabian baths at Pompeii (*ILS* 5706) in the time of Sulla. But Vitruvius (5.11), writing at roughly the same time as Agrippa's construction in 20 B.C., claims that building palaestrae is not an Italic custom, and then describes a palaestra—really a gymnasium—with a *laconicum* as normal for Greece. These problems of origins are of course far more complex than can be dealt with here: see the review article of J. DeLaine, "Roman Baths and Bathing," *JRA* 6 (1993) 348–58, esp. 354–55.

99. E. Baltrusch, *Regimen Morum* (Munich, 1988) 152 n. 131.

100. It burned down a year or two later; we do not know how it was related to his baths. See Cavallaro (above, n. 10) 73 for literature. For gymnasia in non-Greek areas of Italy, see the discussion of Delorme (above, n. 92) 433ff., who repeats (435 n. 3) the assertion of Marrou that the Romans rejected gymnastic activity.

101. Polyb. 15.30.7 speaks of the rioting in the palaestra there in 202 B.C.; it is unlikely that this could have been the later great gymnasium, where riots also started (Philo, *In Flaccum* 34, 37ff.—the parodic mime of Karabas in the gymnasium, followed by shouted demands and then public executions in the theater); cf. Delorme (above, n. 92) 139, with the comments of P. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Oxford, 1972) 2.93 n. 208. F. Burkhalter, "Le gymnase d'Alexandrie: Centre administratif de la province romaine d'Égypte," *BCH* 116 (1992) 345–73, is very illuminating about the developments in the Hellenistic/Roman gymnasium there and in Cyrene; cf. n. 123 below. There is a tendency to overestimate the amount of culture in the Hellenistic gymnasium: as far as the *neoi* are concerned, the evidence is overwhelming that their interests were primarily athletic, as C. A. Forbes, *Neoi* (Middletown, 1933) 48, observed.

Pompey built it in 55 B.C., and allegedly claimed it to be primarily a temple.¹⁰² It is a reasonable hypothesis that the senate for the same political reason, namely, distrust of Greek cultural institutions, resisted the construction of permanent gymnasia, long after they had existed for the *iuvenes* in Campania; when one was imposed on them, it was called in Latin “baths,” which would have meant something much more utilitarian. But it too was Greek in conception, though it may not have had the cultural facilities expected in Hellenistic Greece. If this suggestion has merit—and no other explanation has been offered for the absence of such facilities, save perhaps that we are ignorant of earlier baths at Rome—it has the further advantage of explaining why Tiberius, some way into his reign, moved precisely the Apoxyomenos of Lysippus from the vestibule of the baths, somewhat surprisingly and perhaps incredibly, into his own bedroom. To be sure, Pliny also says that he had to replace it with a copy; even so, he was then forced by the clagues in the theater to replace the original, which is proof that it was the original that had the necessary symbolic significance. Agrippa had put in the entrance to his baths probably the most famous expression of Greek gymnasium culture, a *iuvenis* scraping off oil after exercise, thereby making a bold and antitraditional statement of his aims. This symbolism of the Apoxyomenos has been briefly indicated by Zanker,¹⁰³ but it seems well within the bounds of conjecture that Tiberius was making—or at the very least seemed to be making—a symbolic strike against the *iuvenes* of the gymnasium and their factions, by removing precisely the symbol that Agrippa had chosen to represent his baths and their Greek-based culture; but in the same way its forced restoration stands as undeniable evidence of the power of the *iuvenes* to organize the theater clagues against him.

Rome still lacked a Greek agonistic festival. Though the Sebasta at Naples were founded by Augustus in 2 A.D., a similar festival at Rome had to wait until the abortive foundation of Nero¹⁰⁴ and the more enduring Capitolia of Domitian, which was ostentatiously Greek in inspiration. One assumes that the delay was due to the same ingrained conservative opposition that resisted theaters and gymnasia.

102. Tert. *Spect.* 10, confirmed by archaeology and the marble plan. Pompey may have been partly influenced by earlier Italian theater temples, but no other Roman or even Italian theater is so constructed: the African examples may be modeled on the Theater of Pompey; for Pergamene ideological influence, see Gros (above, n. 56); the model of Mytilene was claimed in antiquity, and Sicilian influence has also been touted. For palaestrae as breeding grounds of political trouble, see, e.g., Athen. 602d; Plato, *Leg.* 636B.

103. For the Baths of Agrippa as a Greek institution, see now P. Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus* (Ann Arbor, 1988) 139–40, who argues chiefly from the plan and the Apoxyomenos of Lysippus, which Agrippa set up in the forecourt (Pliny, *NH* 34.62). Note how Philo (n. 109; cf. n. 101 above) uses the term *aleiphobioi* to describe the Alexandrian clague, a variant on *aleiphomenoi*, the standard Greek word for the gymnasium *neoi*; oil is an extraordinarily significant symbol in these ideological battles.

104. Cavallaro (above, n. 10) 67, Leppin 169ff.

IUVENES AND EQUESTRIANS

It was not elderly members of the orders who were supposed primarily to benefit from gymnastics, but rather the *iuvenes*. The organization of the *iuvenes* at Rome and elsewhere, in *sodalicia* and *corpora*, later *collegia*, is attested by hundreds of inscriptions from imperial times.¹⁰⁵ We find them mostly playing at being amateur gladiators and bullfighters,¹⁰⁶ but sometimes indulging in theatricals.¹⁰⁷ They are the equivalent of the Greek polyonymous associations of young men, ephebes, and such like found in all Greek gymnasia.¹⁰⁸ Recent analysis shows that they certainly tend toward the wealthier elements of society, without being exclusively so. Their natural leaders at Rome in the shadowy world of *sodales* and *clientes* will have been the equestrian youth, who occupied the front rows in the theater, though Percennius, the only actual Roman clique leader we know, was only a *gregarius miles* according to our hostile source, Tacitus.¹⁰⁹ As supporters of the factions of the pantomimes, they could, like Drusus, influence the plebs through networks of *operarii theatrales*, the *duces*, *signiferi*, and the *capita factionum*, whose followers we find scrawling their admiring slogans on the walls of Pompeian cafes.¹¹⁰ But Republican parallels suggest how important

105. A new one from Spain (*AE*, 1989, no. 420, p. 128, citing E. Serrano Ramos and P. Rodríguez Oliva, *Baetica* 11 [1989] 237–56) speaks of the games of the *iuvenes* in the theater in 109 A.D. At Pompeii inscriptions about the *iuvenes* and *iuvenalia* are found primarily in the Great Palaestra of Augustan date next to the amphitheater; cf. Delorme (above, n. 92) 436ff. There is a fine summary of the evidence for early *sodalitates* of *iuvenes* by H. S. Versnel in *Lapis Satricanus*, ed. C. M. Stibbe et al. (s'Gravenhage, 1980), 108–27, esp. 119: “But it does constantly emerge that in Roman historiography *iuvenes* were associated more than anyone else with *coniuratio*-like associations and *sodalitates*.” There has been a great deal written about the *iuvenes* recently, especially about their status, e.g., F. Jacques, “Humbles et notables,” *AntAfr* 15 (1980) 217–30, who argues strongly that they were more *humble* than *notable*, and concludes rightly (p. 230): “S’il est probable que la composition sociale des *collegia iuvenum* variait selon les endroits, la place prise par les *humiliores* doit être admise.” Rome at any rate was different; cf. above, n. 76.

106. Kleijwegt (above, n. 79) 109–10. Yet when Varro, *RR* 2, proem 2, speaks of those who “*manus movere maluerunt in theatro ac circo*”—i.e., chironomy—rather than in honest toil, he is talking of *pateres familiae*.

107. Leppin 143, commenting on the well-known connection of the Roman *iuvenes* with the Atellan farce.

108. Kleijwegt (above, n. 79) 104, with the previous literature; and with fresh insights, Roueché, esp. 123–24, 135–40, 152–53. Note there (p. 153) among their many self-definitions the splendid “the Unmarried” (missing in the index). There has been much debate about the social status of the *iuvenes*, modifying the initial view that they were only wealthy.

109. Tac. *Ann.* 1.16. For cliques, see Roueché 132–33, with literature. Lib. *Or.* 41.6 describes the pantomime cliques of his day in terms of pure invective, which cannot be trusted. Much more illuminating, despite the invective, is Philo, *In Flaccum* 135ff., against the influential Isidorus, whose clique, the *aleiphobioi* according to Philo, trained in handclapping and organized rhythmical shouting, must have been gymnasium *iuvenes*, to judge by such a name. Nero, when he wanted to organize his own clique, knew what he was doing when he based it on Alexandrian practice. In fact, if we want to know how cliques were organized, paid, trained, and then suppressed in Tiberian Rome, we need only read Philo’s description of Isidorus.

110. J. L. Franklin, *AJP* 108 (1987) 95–107. The pantomime *fanatici* of *ILS* 4181b are also *sodales*: perhaps a cultic connection is implied.

it was to influence the youth, and how valuable and aggressive they could be in recruiting votes; and these youths, in some cases equestrians, shared the same training as the pantomimes, and kept ostentatious company with them, as later emperors were to do.¹¹¹

IUVENES AND THE LAW

I have kept to the end the most important increment in our evidence. The tension between the stage-struck youth and their elders is now much illuminated by the Tabula Larinas (TL), a battered bronze tablet that records two *senatus consulta*.¹¹² It preserves one of the year 19 A.D., which in turn cites another of the year 11 A.D. as previous authority. Tacitus ignores both of these, so that the TL allows us to understand the legal complexities underlying the attempt of the senate to control the senatorial and equestrian youth who wished to go on the stage or into the arena, and to confirm that this continued to be a burning issue in the years before and after the riots of 14/15.¹¹³ The situation seems at first clear, but is in fact difficult to understand in detail.¹¹⁴ However, we know from Suetonius roughly what had happened.¹¹⁵ Spendthrift youth of the two orders were managing by incurring *ignominia* deliberately to avoid the law, so that they could go on the stage or into the arena. Tiberius exiled them. The TL cannot be found in any other literary reference; and it is now agreed that it has nothing to do directly with some law *de lenocinio coercendo* that is mentioned in the same sentence by Suetonius.¹¹⁶ Before 19 A.D. some bright legal mind had observed that, if a knight was to be exiled for

111. For control of Republican youth, see E. Eyben, *Restless Youth* (London, 1993) 57ff., esp. 60 n. 105. A *ludus saltatorius* for upper-class children existed already in the second century B.C. (Macrob. *Sat.* 3.14.7); more examples are given in Slater, "Three Questions" (above, n. 12). From the time of Antoninus Pius, emperors could safely practice palaestra (*ludere palaestrica, ludicras exercitationes*) without ill repute (Fronto, *Fer. Als.* 3.5, *Ep. ad Marc.* 3.6.1; Galen 6.406 K.), though Titus had cut his ties with his old pantomime friends when he became emperor: Suet. *Tib.* 7.3. Perhaps the turning point was the time of Domitian, when Martial (4.8.1) can take a visit to the palaestra as normal; this would explain Tacitus's extreme annoyance. Yet even Domitian expelled an ex-quaestor from the senate "quod gesticulandi saltandique studio teneretur" (Suet. *Dom.* 8.3).

112. T. A. J. McGinn, *ZPE* 93 (1992) 273, lists the extensive literature.

113. Leppin 142.

114. I do not even attempt here to do more than sketch the legal implications, for which I refer to the articles of Lebek (above, n. 38). One of Lebek's signal merits is to draw renewed attention to the legal difficulties of defining the qualifications for equestrian status, in relation to the XIV rows at this time. But there are many other possible interpretations of the data, since fundamental questions of Roman law are raised, and we are ignorant of much necessary detail. A referee points out that both in the historiography and legal wording we may be seeing signs of conflict between the two orders. I do not myself have direct evidence for this, but it seems a strong possibility.

115. Suet. *Tib.* 35, who refers to the use of *fraus* by the offenders; cf. Juv. 8.185–210 for famous aristocrats as mimes and gladiators, with Leppin 142–47.

116. This is demonstrated by Lebek and McGinn, against some earlier commentators, e.g., R. Talbert, *Senate of Imperial Rome* (Princeton, 1984) 450. Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 2.85; *Dig.* 48.5.11.2 (Papinian) for the law.

going on the stage, all one had to do, in order to cease to be a knight, was to lose one's seat in the theater; and second, to lose one's seat in the theater, all one had to do was to be convicted of a minor offense. Thereby one incurred *ignominia*, ceased to be a knight, and could appear on the stage without being subject to the severe penalty of exile, though one should note that no penalty is specified by the TL itself. The authorities did not appreciate what was happening at first, but by 19 they were clearly very annoyed at this barefaced evasion of the *maiestas* and *auctoritas* of the senate by some of the youth, who had been defined in the *senatus consultum* of 11 A.D. as men under twenty-five and, surprisingly, women under twenty. It is this loophole that the TL seeks to close. It forbids anyone to make a theatrical or gladiatorial contract with a closely defined group whose status is strangely based on a familial right to sit in the fourteen rows of knights' seats. I offer here for the convenience of the reader only a rough translation of some of the more important lines (4–14) of this graphic document, since the many lacunae and uncertainties make consultation of the Latin text unavoidable:¹¹⁷

[4] Whereas the consuls Marcus Silanus and Lucius Norbanus Balbus have reported that they have compiled a dossier, as they were instructed, concerning senate decrees referring [to the offspring (5) of senators] or to those who contrary to the dignity of their rank have betaken themselves to the stage or the gladiatorial school, and [that young people are acting (6) contrary] to the senate decrees that were composed on this subject in earlier years, by resorting to a loophole [*fraus*], thereby undermining the sovereign will of the senate: [What measures are to be taken? On this matter the senators have decreed as follows: (7) It is] voted, that the son or daughter, the grandson or granddaughter, the great-grandson or great-granddaughter of a senator or a man [who has himself, or his father or grandfather,] on mother's or father's side, [8] or his brother, (had the right to be a spectator in the knights' seats,) or a woman whose husband or father or grandfather on [mother's or father's side, or whose brother has ever had the right] to be [9] a spectator in the knights' seats, may not be brought by anyone on stage or be sworn as a gladiator, or be contracted by anyone [to kill wild animals,] [10] or pluck the plumes of gladiators, or take up[?] the wooden baton, or provide [assistance to anyone else who offers] [11] some similar service; and that none of those named may enter into a contract. And the above provision is to be observed more carefully, in that [earlier decrees of the senate are to be subjoined,] for this reason, namely, that, for the sake of [12] avoiding the authority of that order, persons who had the right to sit in the knights' seats had taken trouble either [13] to incur [public *ignominia*] or be condemned by a court to loss

117. I follow the text and German translation of Lebek, *ZPE* 81 (1990) 60–63. There is an English translation of all twenty-two lines with very useful commentary and discussion also in B. Levick, "The SC from Larinum," *JRS* 73 (1983) 97–115.

of their rights, and after they had ceased [to be able to sit in the] [14] knights' seats, they had taken the gladiatorial oath or had gone on the stage.

There is, I fancy, a note of desperation as well as anger in this legalism. Even so, we see here only one of the ways in which the youth were trying to get round the laws preventing them from going on the stage. There are several hints of other ways, which show that the legal ingenuity of the youth was not so easily stifled. Later, for example in 27, when pantomimes were gone and Tiberius even stopped that favorite of the *iuvenes*, beast hunts "in the city theaters,"¹¹⁸ some people built theaters outside the city, and these could be so large and so jerry-built that they fell down and killed huge numbers of people. Once again some people are trying to evade the Tiberian and senatorial decrees restricting games. A very similar but more obvious evasion, however, we have already met. That was the private theater. The Roman house with its peristyle can be converted very easily into a theater, and that was what was expressly forbidden by the senate in 15.¹¹⁹ The law against public performance had been evaded by moving the pantomimes into one's home, where one could also act oneself, or apparently in some cases enjoy the dancing of one's wife or children.¹²⁰ The question of what constituted *ignominia* for noble artists in private was a well-worked theme for the rhetorical schools,¹²¹ who thought up their extreme examples; but it was also a peculiarly difficult legal problem.¹²² Labeo has to define what a *scaena* is, since the praetor's edict had inflicted *ignominia* on anyone who appeared on it.

118. Dio 58.1a: "Tiberius decided to banish the *venationes* from the city; and when in consequence some people tried to exhibit them outside, they perished in the ruins of their own theaters, which were made of wooden planks." This looks like a "pluralizing" exaggeration, and must refer to the collapse in 27 of the amphitheater at Fidenae (Tac. *Ann.* 4.62, Suet. *Tib.* 40), built by an ex-slave for people "avidī talium imperitante Tiberio procul voluptatibus habiti." Tacitus shows bias in that he does not mention that Tiberius banished the *venationes* and gives vulgar entrepreneurial profit as the motive for the deficient construction. The senate ruled that only those with 400,000 HS could give such games; this looks like the knights' census, as assumed by H. Galsterer, "Spiele und 'Spiele'," *Athenaeum* 59 (1981) 410ff., esp. 414 n. 10, who sees the main problem in "Haftungsklagen aus der Lex Aquila." If so, the issue was one of insurance rather than status.

119. Cf. W. Jashemski, *The Gardens of Pompeii* (New York, 1979) 101, for the setting. Tac. *Ann.* 1.77; cf. Vell. Pat. 2.126.2.

120. I take the opportunity to query the usual (Lebek, *ZPE* 81 [1990] 48; but see now Leppin 43 and 146 n. 62) translation of Sen. *Ad Helviam*, *Dial.* 12.12.6: "beatiores istos putas, quorum pantomimae deciens sesterio nubunt, quam," etc. The context requires that these *pantomimae* are the daughters of the wealthy, i.e., the *matronae* who are forbidden by the TL to dance. Seneca is being sarcastic. Passages like Suet. *Nero* 4; Juv. 6, Oxford fr. 19; Sen. *QN* 7.32.3; Dio 54.2.5, 55.10.11; as well as the explicit interdiction of the TL show that plenty of young women, married or not, of good family could dance "better than they should have" on their private stages, perhaps provoked by the professional dancing girls they see at dinner, according to Juvenal 11.165. Lebek, *ZPE* 81 (1990) 47, remarks of these upper-class amateur danseuses: "schwerlich 'Matronen' sondern eher ausgesprochen jugendliche Gestalten."

121. Rawson, *PBSR* 55 (1987) 83–114 at 106 n. 131; but contrast Leppin 77 n. 33 on the revealing legal problem at Quint. 3.16.8.

122. Lebek, *ZPE* 81 (1990), esp. 49, 52. I take the examples from him.

Some people clearly had raised quibbles about what constituted a stage. The jurist Sabinus of the time of Tiberius defines that those who go on to the stage for personal profit are punished with *ignominia*, but athletes are not so punished because they perform not for gain but for honor. Did some aristocratic pantomimes, with their rigorous athletic training in the gymnasium under a *paidotribēs*, claim to be athletes?¹²³ This would cast light on variants of pantomime such as “dance-wrestling,” *orchestopala*. Or again we have a ruling that umpires do not perform *ars ludicra* because they perform a *ministerium*.¹²⁴ The TL, however, specifically adds to forbidden performances aspects of *ministerium*, especially for gladiators but also for stage performance, which we can occasionally see to be part of the training of *iuvenes*.¹²⁵ The simple law “Knights shall not perform *ars ludicra* on the stage” is deconstructed by legal minds into “What and where is a stage? What is a knight? What does ‘appear’ mean?” For our purposes, however, the TL is lively testimony to the legal zeal employed by the equestrian *iuvenes* to reach their goal of performing publicly, and so to subvert the will of Tiberius and the senate.

CONCLUSIONS

Some of the pantomimes and some of the gladiators who appeared in the years between 14 and 19 were ex-equestrians performing for money. They had incurred *ignominia* and had been legally and formally expelled from the order, and some unfortunately expelled also from the country; but others had also achieved their goal of becoming popular professionals, and earning legally the huge sums reserved for such types, because the mere fact that they had been equestrians was clearly a great attraction with the crowds, and they would not have persisted if exile had been enforced rigorously.¹²⁶ These performers, more than any other pantomimes, no matter how famous, were in a position to defy the authorities. A network of relationships bound together the performers and their friends in the front fourteen rows and the orchestra, not least among them

123. Lib. *Or.* 64.104 mentions the education. For the direct connection of pantomime with the gymnasium exercise, cf. the interesting inscription of a professional *pyrrichistēs*—as I understand it—from Amastris, dealt with by C. P. Jones in “The Bacchantes of Pontus” *EMC* 9 (1990) 53–63. But archaeology could suggest the same connections. At Pompeii a gymnasium behind the theater was turned into a gladiatorial school; at Thugga the *xustica*—perhaps only arcades—are connected with the theater: *CIL* 8, Supp. 4, 26606; in Baetica the *iuvencalia* take place in the theater (see n. 105 above). At Pompeii the *schola iuventutis* was next to the *balneum* of the Venerii, whom Galsterer (above, n. 118) 426 claims to be members of the Pompeian *iuventus*. There was plenty of opportunity for the youth and the theater artists to get together, quite apart from equestrian-owned *popinae*.

124. *Dig.* 3.3.41 (Ulpian), cited by Lebek, *ZPE* 81 (1990) 76.

125. Specifically forbidden is acting as a *pinnirapus* (TL 1.10); yet we find that one instructor of the *iuvenes* is the *pinnirapus iuvenum* Caius Cominienus Fortunatianus (*ILS* 6635); “this man can be identified as a professional trainer of gladiatorial techniques,” as Kleijwegt (above, n. 79) 109 says. How were the *iuvenes* supposed to use their skills acquired from him?

126. Leppin 142 n. 37 gives a list of dancing aristocrats.

Drusus. I have, however, suggested that not just rank and personal contact in their houses but common athletic ideals in the neighboring Campus and baths created bonds between powerful and highly visible groups in the front seats and the performers.¹²⁷

Where the knights sat and what they shouted was of importance, and the shouting of themselves and their supporters was doubtless orchestrated by claqueurs to be effective; not surprisingly the authorities paid close attention to these acclamations.¹²⁸ In the years 14 and 15, there were roughly two thousand knights—many of them rowdy young men of military age and experience—crowded together in groups in the front rows, with the numerically much inferior senate, representing an older generation, in front of and below them. Drusus acted as a patron for some faction. A number of the younger knights, the pantomimes, and probably the people to a large extent are displeased at the parsimony of a new emperor, who is increasingly not there. Then there was the old tension between the knights and the people, who resented that the best seats had been taken from them. Horace assumes that the people and knights will shout against one another as a matter of course.¹²⁹ There was, finally, the tension between the factions established by the supporters of individual pantomimes, who had themselves strong personal connections with senators and knights. There was therefore no shortage of exploitable antipathy.

The seating of the theater was meant to function as the most evident symbol for the organization of the Roman people, in that it visibly imposed an almost Platonic order on society in its central meeting place. But it was, like all imposed order, an order that created stress.

McMaster University

127. Cf. Roueché 136 of a later period: "There was therefore a particularly close bond in the theatre between performers of various kinds and the associations of young men." But the same must have been true of Philo's Alexandria (cf. n. 109 above), since trained clagues are primarily for the theater, and only secondarily political.

128. This is proved by a yet-unpublished SC on the murder of Piso.

129. Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.182; cf. Plut. *Cic.* 13.